UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,669	11/28/2001	Luis F. Stevens	42390.P13113	5724

8791	7590	12/23/2004

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/997,669	LUI F STEVENS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LeChi Truong	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 November 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>11/28/2004</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-25 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield et al

(6,253,252 B1).

3.   **As to claim 1,** Schofield teaches the invention substantially as claimed including:

distributed processing system (Distributed computing, col 1, ln 37-38), a plurality of processing

object (the client and server application, col 4, ln 5-6), an interface in the management system

(col 2, ln 37-39), a deferred procedure call (synchronous and asynchronous client stub function,

col 7, ln 55-59), an interface definition language (IDL, col 7, ln 12-13-16), defining a deferred

procedure call from first processing object to a second processing object according to an

interface definition language(col 7, ln 53-58/ col 4, ln 3-9). Schofield do not explicit teach the

term object management system for management system. However, Schofield teaches object

management system (the object management group "OMG", col 2, ln 10-12 and ln 32-33). It

would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the at the time the invention was made to

apply the teaching of Schofield because Schofield's the object management group would

provides a communication hub for all objects in the system passing the request to the server and

returning respond to the client.

4.   Claims **2, 4, 6-9, 11, 13, 15-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Schofield et al (6,253,252 B1) and further in view of Waddington (Supporting Multimedia

in Distributed Object Environments).

5.   **As to claim 2**, Schofield teaches the interface in the object management system defines a

deferred procedure call from a processing object to a processing object (col 2, ln 10-12 and ln

32-33/ col 7, ln 53-58/ col 4, ln 3-9).

6.   Schofield does not explicit a control plane, a data plane. However, Waddington teaches a

control plane, a data plane (the data plane, the control plane, sec: 4.2.4, ln 2-5).

7.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching Schofield and Waddington because Waddington's the data

plane, the control plane would maintain one of requirement of a Distributed Object Environment

to support a common base of distributed application.

8.   **As to claim 4**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 4 above. In additional, Schofield teaches a non-blocking procedure call (col 3, ln

12-16).

9.   **As to claim 6,** Schofield teaches execute a crosscall stub to initiate the procedure call to

the second processing object (col 3, ln 51-56/col 6, ln7-10), execute a callback skeleton in

response to receipt of a return value form the second processing object (the client call the stub

functions in the client stub file 79, col 7, ln 53-58, one of the stub function is an asynchronous

client stub function and CEE_OBECT_CALL_POST ... when a response to the object is returned to the client application, col 11, ln 21-26), the crosscall stub and callback skeleton are derived from a complication a deferred procedure call instruction formatted according to the interface description language(col 7, ln 12-18/ ln 30-34/ ln 52-56).

10. **As to claim 7,** Schofield teaches the second processing object to execute a crosscall skeleton in response to a procedure call from the crosscall stub (col 7, ln 31-34/ col 8, ln 49-54).

11. **As to claim 8,** Schofield teaches the crosscall stub and callback skeleton comprise image generated from a compilation of a single procedure call interface definition formatted according to the interface description language (col 7, ln 12-18/ ln 30-34/ ln 52-56), the second processing object comprises logic to asynchronously call back the first processing object in response to the procedure call (col 8, ln 35-40).

12. **As to claim 9,** it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Waddington teaches a first processing core adapted to process information received from transmission medium, second processing medium (Sec: 1, ln 3-6, Sec: 3.11, Sec: 2, ln 15-16/ln 1-3/ Sec: 2.4, ln 2-4), data packet (Sec: 3.1.3, ln 54-57).

13. **As to claims 11, 13, 15-17;** they are apparatus claims of claims 2, 4, 6-8; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 4, 6-8 above.

14. **As to claim 18,** it is an apparatus claim of claims 1 and 6; therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 6 above. In additional, Schofield teaches crosscall stub image, callback skeleton image (client stub function, col 7, ln 31-34/ client stub function and CEE_OBJECT_CALL_POST, col 11, ln 21-25).

15.   **As to claim 19**, Schofield teaches linking the crosscall stub image and callback skeleton

image with a crosscall skeleton image associated with second processing object (col 8, ln 14-18).

16.   **As to claims 20-25,** they are apparatus claims of claims 2, 18-19; therefore, they are

rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 18-19 above.

17.   Claims **3, 10, 12, 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schofield et al (6,253,252 B1) in view of Waddington (Supporting Multimedia in Distributed

Object Environments) and further in view of Rajesh Krishna Balan (Performace Analysis of the

Intel IXP 1200 Network Procesor).

18.   **As to claim 3**, Schofield and Waddington do not teach microengine processes. However,

Balan teaches microengine processes (microengine, sec: 1, ln 12-15).

19.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Schofield, Waddington and Balan because Balan's

microengine would makes the data processing engines to be able to archive high IPC numbers

due to its hardware support for multiple threads.

20.   **As to claims 10, 12, 14,** they are apparatus claims of claim 5; therefore, they are rejected

for the same reason as claim 5 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

December 3, 2004

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100